body had been speaking evil of me to Mr. Bowen. I said, ". Very well; if that is the case I will go and see Mr. Bowen at use," and asked Mr. Johnson to accompany me.

Q. Didn't Mr. Johnson suggest to you that you had better see Mr. Bowen about it? A. I think not; I think that was my own spontaneous impulse, that I asked Mr. Johnson to go with ill be might have suggested it or acquiesced in it, as he was a discreet man.

Q. Didn't you understand Mr. Johnson had come over to se

you that afternoon for the purpose of suggesting this? A. That I don't remember; still, it would have been just like him Q. And in your interest, and as a friendly act ? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Now, about what time of day on Monday did you go to Mr. Bowen's ! A. Oh, in the afternoon, sometime. Q. And Mr. Johnson was with you during that whole inter view? A. No, Sir; Mr. Johnson left before the interview was

ended. Q. Before it was ended? A. I think Mr. Johnson left in time to go over to New York for the Christmas dinner. That is my

Q. Then it was a long interview? A. I don't think it was Q. About how long? A. Well, I don't know; perhaps an

hour and a half; perhaps longer; perhaps shorter.

A. And about how much of that time did Mr. Johnson re

main? A. I could not say at this length of time. Q. Perhaps you can tell us whether he was there during greater part of the interview or not. Your saying, leaving to get the dinner would not carry him over very early necessar fly? A. My Impression is that Mr. Johnson was there during the greater part of the interview, but not during the most important part of the interview.

Q. The most important part occurred after he left, you think? A. The most vivid parts; yes, Sir.

Q. You mean by that the most violent part? A. No; the

Q. Now, who introduced that conversation, and how was it troduced? A. That morning? Q. Yes. A. Oh! I don't remember that. Probably I did my

Q. You cannot tell us what you said to Mr. Bowen at th

outset? A. No, Sir. Q. Can you tell us what Mr. Bowen said to you at the outset! A. I fhink he said "Good morning."

Q. Can you tell us what Mr. Johnson said at the outset, if he said snything? A. No. Sir.

Q. You did have some conversation there, you three together, didn't you? A. Yes, Sir; I can tell you the substance of the

Q. Well, I will go on with my question. Now, did you or no inform Mr. Bowen that you would come there for the purpose of talking with him in regard to any stories that he had heard against you? A. I came there, Sir; I went there.
Q. Did you tell him that? A. I don't remember what I told

him, but I quite likely told him just that for that was precisely the object of the interview. Q. Did he then tell you what the stories were ! A. No. Sir he only told me there were stories, I pressed him to know what they were, but he would not tell me.

Q. Did he tell you what the nature of the stories was ? A. He told me the stories were coming down on me like an avalanche That I remember. Mr. Bowen is given to metaphors. Q And the nature? A. Threatening to sweep me away

stories of immoralities; stories of attrocity. He pictured the

scenes very vividly. Q. He did? A. Yes, Sir; but he would not tell me what they ere, and he would not tell me who told him; but the substance of the interview I had with him was: "Mr. Bowen," I said bring here to me in your presence everybody who has any thing against me, and let us have it out face to face." He said. "That is fair." Then we went to another topic.

THE COMPOSITION OF BOWEN'S AVALANCHE.

Q. Now, was not enough said there to make you understand that the stories related to immorality or profligacy with women? A. Stories, Sir, concerning my relations with women, and my drinking, and my brutality, and other things—a dreadful volume of it—all that went to make Mr. Bowen's nche. He told me that they came to him from all quarters of the world, all of a sudden. [Laughter.]

Q. And did you suggest in 'any way, or did it come to be a

matter considered there, that if these stories were true yo would have to leave his employment? A. No, Sir; he said i those stories were true I ought not to live a day longer, and I agreed with him in that sentiment. [Laughter.] Judge Nellson-Silence!

Q. Didn't you understand that the reason for seeing Mr. Bowen, or your friend, Mr. Johnson, thinking it proper for you to see Mr. Bowen was that the stories that had been told him concerning you were such as would not tolcrate your continuing in his employment ? A. Not at all, Sir: for Mr. Bowen had for fifteen years retailed himself just such stories concerning Mr. Beecher, and he had all that tim been Mr. Beecher's chief pewholder, and Mr. Beecher had been his chief writer, and no such stories as those would have affect ed Mr. Bowen's regard for any man in his employ, whether as minister or editor. [Murmur in the audience.]

Q. Well, that is very bad for Mr. Bowen. He was above projudices of that kind? A. Yes, Sir; entirely so. He about od them all in the House of God. [A louder demonstration.1 Judge Nellson-Will the audience keep quiet? The busines

Is interrupted by it. Q. Now, were you aware at that time of the particulars of

any injurious stories respecting yourself in this direction? A. No, Sir, the horror of the whole business was that it was all unknown; it was an avaianche coming upon me in the dark. didn't know what it was, but I felt that my first duty as a gentleman was to go and see Mr. Bowen face to face and, as I said before, the substance of the conversation Q. No matter that is not what I am now asking? A. To bring

the accusers face to face. He said that was fair.

Q. That you have said already; but my question now is whether you were not yourself aware of the alleged circum-stances of profligacy or immorality that were told to your prejunice. A. No, Sir; I did not know them until a few days afterwards, when Mr. Beecher certified that he had been my slanderer by taking it back in writing.

Q. And you had never heard any of these rumors concerning

conduct in this relation, prejudicial to you until Mr. Bowen told you that there was an avalanche upon you? A. In what

Q. In these relations with women? A. No. Sir.

You never heard of it? A. Just about that time, either before or after, there was a little evening newspaper in New York scandalized the community by saying that I was going to Europe to clope with a lady. [Laughter.] She had already gone several months before—a few months before. That is the only story I ever heard. That was a lie.

Well, I am not speaking of the truth of the stories only want to know the state of your knowledge or mind at tha time. Well, that you had been aware of, that imputation? A. I am not certain at this distance of time whether it occurred a little after or a little before.

Q. Well, isn't it very probable that it was before? A. I don't

know, Sir.

Mr. Beach-Well, no matter about probabilities.

Mr. Evarts-Well, I ask, isn't it very probable that it was be fore? A. I don't know whether it was or not. There is no end to the probabilities of slander.
Q. I agree. A. Or the improbabilities.

Q. I only want to find the state of slander as it became known

to you. A. Yes, Sir.
Q. Did this imputation, that you were aware of, contain any particulars as to person or circumstances? A. Yes, Sir; there was a bold and vulgar allusion to a very honored lady in this

Q. Very well ; I didn't care to disturb the matter further than to know what you had heard concerning stories about

yourself. A. Yes. Q. Had you heard prior to this of stories to your prejudice connected with any transaction at Winsted, Connecticut A. No, Sir; oh, yes, there had been a long time before, a story published to the effect that I had gone to Winsted with a lady not my wife-published sometime during the political cam

Q. The political campaign of what year-1868? A. I don't remember. I was away off in the West, and Oliver Johnson sont that out to me. That was three or four years before that Q. That you had heard of them? A. That was an old tale;

Q. Still, you had heard of it? A. Yes, Sir, years before, Q. Now, had you heard of a story injurious to yourself in connection with any female at Faribault, in Minnesota? A. No. Sir; never have heard any such story until now. I didn't know

that there was such a one. Q. Well, that you had not heard of? A. No, Sir; what is the

The Witness-Let us have it.

Mr. Beach-No; we are getting enough that is immaterial and

incompetent now,
Mr. Evarts-I don't propagate the stories. I want to know the state of your knowledge; that is all. Do you mean to say then, that this information from Mr. Bowen that there were current these stories to your prejudice was a surprise to you

A Yes, Sir; I should think it would be to any man Q Well, I don't know that. I am only asking of yourself.

Well, I am only speaking for myself, Sir.
Q. It was a surprise to you that there should be such stories

Yes, Sir; it was an astonishment. Q. Please look at this letter and at the date of it, and see if that is not a mistaken date. Shouldn't it be January, 1870? is a common error, you know, of keeping the old year. I, of course, know nothing about it? A. You must let me read the

Oh, Yes; you may read the letter. [Handing witness the letter. ] A. Now, Mr. Evarts, will you ask me again what ques-

tion you desire to put? Q. My only question was whether, upon looking at that date you could say whether that was an erroneous date, that it was really 1870 instead of 1860, or not. You know it is a common the first days of a new year that one may make; whether there is anything about that letter that enables you to say ject of using The Brooklyn Union in discussion of Plymouth was her that is the true date, 1809, or whether the true date a 1 Unirch matters? A. Well, I think he did: at all events Mr.

1870! A. This is dated Tidioute, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1860. I was unquestionably lecturing there. I might refer to some little memoraudum book of my lectures. I could not say from

Q. Well, you remember writing the letter, and the occa of its being written, I suppose? A. Yes, Sir. Q. But you cannot say now whether it was written in 1869? A.

think Mr. Johnson wanted me to write something; that is my

Q. No matter. I only want to get at this date. You cannot

give it, you say? A. No, Sir; but I can look on my memoran-dum book and see whether I was in Tidioute in 1899 or not.

Q. Of course, on its face, it would be perfectly regular that i

Mr. Evarts-I propose to read that. [Handing the paper to

laintiff's counsel.] Your Honor, it has reached the hour of

Theodore Tilton was recalled and the cross-examination re

Mr. Evarts-Have you been able to fix in any way whether

that should be a date of 1870 or 1869? [Handing witness a leter.] A. I have not given any thought to the subject, Sir.

Mr. Evarts [to plaintiff's counsel]-Will you give us the 1869

and 1870 letters? [To the Witness]: Where is this place of

Tidioute? Is that the proper pronunciation of it? A. No.

Q. How is it pronounced? A. Pronounced "Tidiute,"

Q. Where is it? A. In Pennsylvania somewhere. I lectured

there once; that is all I know about the place.

Q. Somewhere in the oil-regions? A. I don't know about

Q. I suppose they are; I know nothing about them. We have

Q. Look over those of 1870 and see whether from those dates

when you were in Tidioute on the 8th of January, and not 1869:

A. I think that certain letters have been put in evidence already

at this moment whether I lectured there more seasons than or

Q. But you would not have been in Ohio on the 10th if you

1869-70 and 1868-69 you were on a regular lecture tour, were

Q. Both the seasons of 1869-70 and of 1858-69 you were off

Q. You have read this letter, haven't you? A. You handed

it to me this morning. I glanced at it hastily. Do you de

Q. Yes; you may read it if you wish to. I want to ask you

whether in reading the letter you then can recall whether the

ncident which that letter refers to, occurred in 1869 or 1868. It

had occurred prior to that letter of course? A. Yes, Sir; Mr.

Evarts, I will tell you how to fix the date exactly. Produce in

Court Mrs. Tilton's memorandum books or diaries for the last

four or five years. She took them away from the house. It was at her request that I took this protege of hers there. She

Q. I am not talking about the contents of the letter at all; I

Judge Neilson-He wants to know whether you can fix the

Q. Do you think that is the correct date? A. I should have

aid it was the correct date, and then Mr. Evarts casts a doubt

Q. Can you see by to-morrow morning whether it is correct

Mr. Evarts-Your own letters, if you have the originals of

Q. I have not read all the letters. A. You have had them, as

Q. All that have been printed I have not had, except what I

Q. All that have been read are in evidence, of course; but all

hat have been printed have not been read in evidence; but as

ell by them whether you were in the oil regions on the 8th of

letters will speak for themselves. There they are; and if the letters don't speak for themselves, I think, perhaps, my little

ooks of record, my little lecture note-books, of which I have

several at home, may fix the date. I do not see, though, why

the date should not be correct as it is written.

Q. Of course, only you know that in the first days of January

is a common error to put the wrong year. That you know,

don't you? A. It is with some people, Sir.

Q. Well, it happens to anybody, I suppose; it certainly does

Q. And I suppose it happens to anyone. Well, now, can yo

impression is that it was a considerable period before that, but

as I said before my memory of dates is not very good unless

associated with some event which bears a date. Mrs. Tilton

Q. Well, I don't know how that is. I don't know what she

Judge Neilson—Don't refer to Mrs. Tilton again, please.
Q. Now, look at that letter and say if that refers to what ha

as the Winsted letter? [Handing witness letter.] A. Yes Sir

Q. And my only object is to get at the date of-if I can. You

poke of it as being an old story ? A. Yes, Sir, a very disgrace

Q. Well, I dare say. That we have nothing to do with. It is

only the question of the stories that were presented. A. I sup-soosed that it was in that particular that it interested you most.

Q. We are quite aware that persons are scandalized. You

nay have been as well as other people; but the date of it, and your

knowledge of it are important to me, and if you can fix that by

an examination of your original letters, or if you will take this

winted pamphlet that will fix it. I suppose? A. I will do my

best to oblige you.

Q. Now, at this interview between you and Bowen, was there

particularization or a reference to & charge that had been made

against you to Mr. Bowen on the part of a lady that was con-

ected, in some way, as contributor, or otherwise, with the pa

Q. Well, of course I am speaking of what was mentioned. You

av, then, that at that interview Mr. Bowen did not inform vo

hat he had received an accusation against you on the part of

lady that was employed in connection with those newspapers?

A. No, Sir, he never in his life gave me any such information

never, from that day to this.
Q. How did this part of the interview, then, that related to

vourself, and yourself alone, close—that Bowen was to confront rou, or that— A. It closed in this way: I told Mr. Bowen that f anybody had anything to say against me let him invite that

person, and also invite me, to a personal interview, face to face.

Mr. Bowen's presence. Mr. Bowen replied, "That is fair.

Q. And that is the way that branch of it closed? A. Yes.

Q. Now, you have stated that at that interview, Mr. Bower

Q. Mr. Bowen at this interview opened upon charges against

Q. Yes. A. He opened the charges; he didn't open upon

Q. My question will stand, and we will take your answer.

What had led to that in any previous conversation on that occa-sion that you had had with Mr. Bowen? A. This, Sir; after

Mr. Bowen said that that would be fair, he changed the sub-

ject : he said to me that in view of my recently formed con

tracts to write for The Independent, and to become editor of th

The Brooklyn Union, that he hoped I would put my whole life and

fire into The Brooklyn Union, that I would treat all Brooklyn top-

es with great particularity, and that I would make among

them one conspicuous and chief, namely. Plymouth Church

and all its affairs, for he said: "That church has a large con

gregation, and many of the readers of The Union are there,

and he then said, "I notice that you have not given par icular attention to the church, and indeed you have not at

ended the church for some months, and your absence has been

eather noticed by me." I told him that I never again should

Q. Mr. Johnson was present at this part of the conversation was he not? A. I think he was, but I would not be quite cer-

tain at what time Mr. Johnson left. I think Mr. Johnson threw in some such remark as this: "Perhaps Mr. Tilton has a reason

for not going to Plymouth Church;" something of that kind.

Q. You think he was there? A. I think he was there at a

Q. And that he did throw in an observation? A. I think he

Q. Of that character? A. And I think that Mr. Johnson very

ross the threshoold of Plymouth Church.

part of that conversation

did; yes, Sir.

ned upon charges against Mr. Beecher? A. What is that

per of which you were the editor? A. Not that I know of, Sir

thing of that sort was mentioned.

ir, that is the way it ended.

bem. [Laughter.]

Mr. Beecher? A. Opened upon charges?

n spoken of here, and I think on Mr. Moulton's examination

to do with this? A. Well, I will tell you what she had !

to January, 1869, or only antecedent to Jan. 8, 1870

ther this matter of Winsted did occur anteceden

you have the originals here in your own handwriting, you can

January, 1869, or the 8th of January, 1870? A. Well, Sir, the

those that are printed, will show you where you were on the 10th of January, in both of those years? A. Mr. Evarts, you

r not? A. Well, I have no access to Mrs. Tilton's disry.

Q. We are not talking about her diary.

Mr. Evarts-No! no! we have nothing to do with that.

The Witness-I will look, Sir, through my own-

ave had the originals in your hands of all those letters.

ave read. A. They are at your service.

A. May it please your Honor, the date is here -Jan. 8th,

Mr. Evarts-Well, but he was on a lecturing tour.

-It is very easy to travel that distance.

nderstand why.

sire me to read it?

vant the date of it.

o me? A. Yes.

do with it. Sir.

Mr. Beach-No, no.

Judge Nellson-N

n tall wan all about it. Sir.

The Witness-I beg your pardon.

on not? A. How is that?

on a lecture tour ? A. Yes, I think so.

will fix the date exactly by her diary.

em to be so. A. Well, Sir, what do you wish me t

out this time. A. Are these correctly printed?

The Court here took a recess until 2 P. M.

didu't go to my own house during the recess.

The Court met at 2 p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

ould be 1809! A. Yes, Sir.

rtly afterwards left. In other words, when the conversaon concerning the stories about me was ended, Mr. Johnson left, either then or a little afterwards. He did not stay long to hear our discussion about the papers.

Q. But staid until after Mr. Bowen had opened on this sub-

Johnson made some remark about reasons which I might possibly have for not going to Plymouth Chuurch. That is as Q. And you then made the observation that you have just re-

sted? A. I don't know that I made it then; I think perhaps might have made it before, or possibly I made it after. Q. You mean before Johnson's; you made it either before after Johnson's remark? A. Yes, Sir; I made it sometime dur-Q. In this connection his observation was made in co

with yours, or yours in connection with his, was it not? A. Yes, Sir, but it was not so much in reference to the paper as it vas in reference to my going to church Q. Weil, I am not talking now about the paper, I am talking

Q. Well, how did the matter go on then on Mr. Bowen's par after that observation of yours? A. After Mr. Johnson left? Q. No, I don't eate. I will find out whether he was there o ot, if I can, but after this observation of yours? A. think very much was said until after Mr. Johnson left, when Mr. Bowen put some questions to me to know why it was that I did not go to Plymouth Church. That is the part that I now distinctly remember.

MR. BOWEN'S DENUNCIATION OF MR. BEECHER. Q. When did Mr. Bowen commence stating his ccusations or imputations against Mr. Beecher? A. I can't member exactly at what part of the conversation he dis some of them were stated before Mr. Johnson went away

others were stated after he went away.

Q. Well, did he pursue the matter at some length? A. Well, at some length, necessarily.

Q. You have given on the direct examination, have you not, abstantially what he said? A. Yes, Sir. Q. As you remember it? A. Yes, Sir. What did you say after he had completed the accusa-

Q. Now, don't you remember whether you were there in January, 1869, or January, 1870? A. I don't remember anything more than the date of the letter, Sir.
Q. Won't you look at this collection of letters? [Handing ons against Mr. Beecher? A. I don't think he did complete hem; I think he kept reiterating them.

Q. Well, but he left off some time or other, didn't he! A witness the book.] There are some dates in January, 1869, Not until I left the house.

Q. Didn't he? A. No. Q. Well, when he had got through with them for the first , what did you say-anything? A. Do you mean what I said at such a particular moment? I don't identify any such rticular moment.

Q. It is not as to the lapse of time; it is as to the stage of the upposing them to be correct, it would not be the year 1870 aversation. If you don't remember, why I can't help it; if you do, I want to know. A. Mr. Bowen was very solicitous to now from me what Mr. Beecher's relation had been to Mrs. from Tidioutc. I presume they have dates. I don't remember

Q And asked, did he? A. Yes, after Mr. Johnson away. I had said before Mr. Johnson went away that Mr Seecher had been guilty of dishonorable behavior towards Mrs vere in Tideoute on the 8th, would you? A. Well, Sir, I can't

Q. That you stated while Mr. Johnson was there? A. Yes Sir: or that in substance. Q. When did the suggestion of the preparation of this letter

demand on Mr. Beecher come up? A. I think that came up Mr. Bowen's private conversation with me, toward the close f that interview. Q. Which suggested it, you or he? A. Mr. Bowen suggested

He said that Mr. Beecher ought not to be allowed to preach Mr. Evarts - [To plaintiff's counsel]; I would like this letter f demand, one of the early exhibits, No. 4.
[Mr. Morris produced the letter called for.]

Q. Take this, if you please, Mr. Tilton. [Handing witnes he exhibit.] Now, the suggestion first came from Mr. Bowen What was that suggestion? What did he say? A. Mr. Bowen said in substance that Mr. Beecher ought not to be allowed to remain in his pulpit or in the city; that he ought to be driven out. Mr. Bowen then said that he could take no steps towards the accomplishment of such an object as that, because he had in the previous Febru ary received from Mr. Beecher a humiliating confession of his ilt, an that Mr. Howen had given him pardon.

Q. Weil, that you stated in your direct examination? A. Yes, Sir: Mr. Bowen, however, stated that if I would make this de mand, which he could not in honor, as he stated, initiate, that he would substantiate it and would bring the volume of evidence which he possessed to see that it was carried into execuion. That is the substance of it.

Q. I believe you said that on your direct examination. Now, he having so stated it, how did you give your assent to acting in the manner that he suggested? A. I said to him, "Give me a pen and a sheet of paper and I will write it." He said, "I

will carry it." Q. Is that the original draft that you wrote! [Referring to A. No, Sir.

Q. Well, have you the original draft? A. Yes, Sir. Q. At any rate it was amended before it was finally copies there, was it? A. What is that?

Q. The draft as originally written was changed in som words before it was copied ? A. Yes, Sir. Q. Do you remember what the change was? I don't care

nything about the paper. A. Well, I remember, per aps, with sufficient accuracy to say that hops, with sufficient accuracy to say that this clause was admitted, "for reasons which explicitly understand." Whether the original draft was in presely these words I don't know, but that is the substance. Q. Was all the original draft, including the amendment, in your handwriting? A. The original draft did not include the

Q. Well, including the amendment that was put upon it. asn't the amendment put on the draft? Of course it may not have been. A. I think not, Sir; perhaps it was not; still I will

not answer positively, Sir. Q. I supposed the amendment was put on it and then the mplete copy taken from it. I don't know? A. It may be.

Q. Very well, that is the change, at any rate. And the adiress, is that your own also? [Showing witness the address.] A. Yes, Sir; I wrote it all except the small writing there; that is Mr. Moulton's. O. Well, we can tell. All that belongs to it as a letter and an

ess is in your handwriting? A. Yes, Sir; every bit of it. Q. Now, when you gave this letter to Mr. Bowen was the envelope closed or scaled? A. I think it was open, Sir; that is Q. It was given to him, was it not, by you, and taken by him

be carried as an open letter to Mr. Beecher? A. Yes, Sir that is myfrecollection. Is not the envelope open now? Q It is open now? A. I mean has it been scaled? Q You may see whether it has been scaled. [Handing wit-

ness the envelope.] It now bears the marks of having been closed? A. Yes, Sir; it was not closed by me. Q. And was not intended to be? A. No, Sir; it was an oper tter as I wrote it. Mr. Bowen must have opened it before de

Q. It was intended to be carried by Bowen open? A. Yes Q. Intended by you to be carried by him open! A. Yes, Sir.

and mentioned and described by me to Mr. Moulton that after-Q. So that this closing it which has taken place -- A. Was

Q. Was not by you or by him with your consent or purpos Q. Was not by you or by min with your one at or purpose.

A Not at all, Sir, Still I didn't lay any injunction upon Mr.

Bowen not to close it. That was no feature in the case. Mr.

Bowen well knew the contents of the letter. It was an open
letter, he and I were jointly responsible for it.

Mr. Evarts-[Reading]: December 26th, 1870. Henry Ward Beecher. Sir: I demand that for reasons which you explicitly under Sir: I demand that for reasons which you e tand, you immediately ccase from the ministr Mr. Beach—Why is it read now?

Mr. Deacd—Way is it read now?
Mr. Evaris—Because I want to use its contents (continuing to read) from the ministry of Plymouth Church, and that you quit the City of Brooklyn as a residence.

[Signed] Theodore Tilton.

Q. That was written so, I suppose! [Referring to the word

Signed."] A. Yes, Sir.
Q. Now, Mr. Titton, how soon after this did you inquire and how soon after inquiring did you hear, what had happened

oncerning and at the delivery of this letter? A. I made no noniry about it, Sir. Well, how soon did knowledge come to you concerning 1? A. The first knowledge that came to me concerning it was brough Mr. Beeecher's own statement to me on Friday night

I that week, Dec. 30th, that it had been delivered. I took i for granted, however, that it had been promptly delivered. That is my recollection at present. BOWEN REGRETS HIS HIGH WORDS.

Q. Now, Mr. Tilton, let me recall your attention the fact that prior to that interview with Mr. Beecher, to which you have now alluded, you had an interview with Mo Bowen. A. I did, Sir.

Q. What day was that interview? A. I dou't remember

whether it was Dec. 27th or 28th.
Q. It was one or the other? A. One or the other; I think so

Q. Now, at that interview did not the question on the subject of this letter's being delivered by Bowen to Mr. Beecher, and the occurrence thereupon, become the subject of conver-sation between you and Mr. Bowen? A. No, Sir; Mr. Bowen was in a wild anger and I had no conversation with him at all. It was the last interview I had previous to the tripartite coveant two years after

Q. Now, how did this interview on the 27th or 28th with owen came about ? A. I will tell you exactly, Sir. Q. Did he send for you or did you go to him spontan Q. Well, how did you get together? A. I will tell you.

I had written this letter on the 26th of December, I told Mr. Moulton about it that afternoon. He told me with great emphasis that I was a fool. Q. Well, that you have told us. A. Yes. Sir; so that either

next morning or the morning after-my impression is the very next morning-I sent a Mr. Bowen by advice of Mr. Moulton, or rather, not by his advice, but by my own judgment, growing out of a suggestion of his, namely, that Mr. Bowen's name ought to have been attached to such a demand, inasmuch as he was to have sustained and enforced it; so I sent a message—I forget whether by note, I think by note—to Mr. Bowen, informing him that I was going to have an interview with Mr. Beecher face to face. Mr. Bowen came pell mell around to the office and then eagle the angry interrigit.

Q. What time of day was this interview? A. It was in the Q. Can't you now recollect whether it was the 27th; whether

it was not the very day after-? A. Well, I don't know; ras either that or the day after.

Q. Wouldn't you have probably learned something about the

tter on the next day if you had heard nothing from him about Brooklynt it? A. What is that, Sir?

Q. Wouldn't you have sought for some information concern ing this letter on the next day if you had not heard from him on that day? A. From whom should I seek it, Sir? Q. Mr. Bowen. A. Why, I had parted from him in anger. ould not have met him; I would not have spoken to him

Q. No, no; not at this time. You had not parted with hir anger then when you sent him off on this errand to Beecher A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Well, now, just listen. If you had not heard something from Bowen on the day immediately following the 26th, wouldn't you have been likely to have sent for him to learn

about the reception that the note sent to Beecher had met ? Mr. Fullerton—One moment. I think this case will be long mough without such speculative questions as that.

Judge Neilson—1 think he may answer that. A. If I under stand the purport of your question, the answer is this: that if Mr. Bowen had came around on that morning in an equable

me of mind, I should certainly have said, "Mr. Bowen, tell me the fate of the letter," but he came around in great ange nd there was no conversation between us. Q. That is not my point. The point is that he did come around the very next morning and if it had not been that he came you would have been likely to have made some enquiry

in that day concerning the reception? A. I think quite likely, yes, Sir, it may be true.
Q. So I supposed. A. I don't say for certain that he cam at morning; yet perhaps it was that morning Q. That it was the very next morning? A. Yee; but still I

won't say for certain.

Q. Now he came around and saw you in your office alone, suppose? A. He and I together, yes, Sir.
Q. Well, you were alone—nobody else there? A. Nobody

Q. Now, can you tell us what the first thing said at tha nterview was? A. Oh, I don't know the first thing.
Q. Do you know which spoke first? A. No, I don't know Mr. Bowen was in a great state of excitement. His face was as

Q. Now, do you mean to say, upon reflection, that not a wo was said about the delivery to Mr. Beecher, and his reception of this note? A. I mean to say exactly that, Sir. Mr. Bowen was in great anger. The substance of what he said if I divulged to Mr. Beecher the accusa tions which he, Mr. Bowen, had made against Mr Beecher, that he, Mr. Bowen, world cease all his relations to me, and that I should never again cross the threshhold of his office, or enter his house. He said that with great chemence and emphasis. That was the substance of the conersation. It was a very brief interview; he allowed me no

time to ask questions of any sort.

Q. Do you mean he left without giving you an opportunity to say anything to him? A. I think the sum and substance what I said to him was to answer pride for pride, scorn for scorn; that I would not be deterred by his threats; that I should tell Mr. Beecher or any other person, utterly uninfluenced by any denunciations of that kind. That is all I remember of

WHAT TILTON EXPECTED OF THE JOINT DEMAND OF BEECHER. Q. And you had no curiousity about the delivery

of the note or its reception? A. I did not have a great deal of curiosity about it. Q Why did'nt you ask Bowen about it ? A. Well, becau Mr. Bowen was not a man to be asked questions of then. He went out of the office slamming the door behind him. I was not the man to seek him out afterwards. The only perso new anything about the matter were Mr. Beecher and Mr.

Bowen. I could not see either of them.

Q. Well, Mr. Bowen was there. A. Mr. Bowen left.

Q. Now, when you sent — when you wrote this demand or Mr. Beecher and sent Mr. Bowen, or delivered it to Mr. Bowen to communicate as your joint act, as you have stated-

Q. What was your object in sending it; what result did you expect from sending it? A. My object was to strike him right to the heart, Sir. Q. Now, what result did you expect from thus striking him

ght to the heart? A. That he would be pricked and wounded as he has been. Q. And nothing more? A. Nothing more Q. You did not expect that he would be driven from the sulpit or from Brooklyn ? A. Yes, Sir; I did.

Q. You did? A. Yes, Sir; and he will, too. [Sensation.] Q Then you did expect— A. I certainly did, Sir.
Q. That from the delivery of that message to him he would e driven from his pulpit and from Brooklyn ? A. Mr. Bowen said that he could drive him out of his pulpit in twelve hours

I believed what Mr. Bowen said. Q. And you thought this would do it ? A. Yes, Sir; I thought that Mr. Bowen would do it. Q. Well, this method would do it? A. I didn't think that my little letter alone would do it. Judge Neilson-He says "this method."

The Witness-This method. Mr. Bowen said that he would drive him out of his pulpit in twelve hours. Q. And you believed him ! A. I believed him; yes, Sir. Q. And you together sent, as your joint act, this letter?

Q. And you expected that result from it? A. Yes, Sir, I did. Q. Now, Mr. Tilton, how soon did you go to your house that day, after this interview with Mr. Bowen, the 27th or 28thchatever it was? A. You mean on the day that I sent the letter demanding Mr. Beecher's retirement?

Q No; on the day of your last interview with Mr. Bowen? A. I do not remember. annot say that. Q. What was your usual time of going home from your offic

or ordinary circumstances? A. Usually I went home and ook lunch at 1 o'clock. Q. And returned to business ? A. Yes, Sir. Q. Now, when you returned to your house that day, were on excited and did you exhibit excitement in your house; leave out all reference now to any interview or with your wife? A. I cannot remember that, Sir.

Q. You do not remember being excited? A. No. Sir; it would be quite likely. Q. In consequence of this interview with Mr. Bowen ? A. I ton't remember being in my house; I do not bring up the cir

Q. You don't remember being in your house at all? A. No.

Q. Did you at your house on that day, on your first visit to it after this interview with Mr. Bowen, say to the nurse and others there (others than your wife) that you were ruined? Q. Nothing of that kind ! A. No, Sir : I was not ruined.

Q. I did not ask you whether you were ruined; I asked you whether you told the nurse and other persons than your wife (whom I leave out of the inquiry) that you were rained?

Well, I answer von no.
Q. Well, so let it stand? A. Yes, Sir; I was not in the habi of talking of my business affairs to the nurse. [Laughter 1] Q. I was not arguing about it; I only want you to answer my

uestions.

Judge Nellson-Please only to answer the questions. I wish the gentlemen would be quiet in Court.

The Witness-I do not remember who the nurse was. What vas the nurse's name, Mr. Evarts?

Mr. Evarts-My dear Sir, when I am on the witness stand vill answer all I know. [Laughter.] Mr. Beach-That will take a very long answer. Mr. Evarts-Do you think so? [To the witness.] Be kin nough just to answer my questions.

Judge Neilson-Only answer the questions, Witness-Mr. Evaris sets me the example of stating verything he knows.

Mr. Evarts—Oh, no. Do you remember being in any excite ment or having any impression that the result of this attack upon Mr. Beecher was going to be disastrons to you? A. Not

all, Sir. How could it have been disastrous? Q. I do not reason with you. I only ask whether you had that impression? A. I had not. Q. Do you not remember on that eccasion of coming to you ise on that day, after this interview with Mr. Bowen, the

you got out your valedictory in *The Independent*, and paced up and down, and exhibiting great excitement, and immediately went to work preparing papers connected with this subject? A. No. Sir. I have no such recollection. Q. You recollect nothing of the kind? A. Nothing of the sor

Q. Did you laform Mr. Moulton of this angry interview with owen? A. I think I did, Sir. Q. And did you then plan any step, in connection with Mr echer, thereupon? A. No. Sir. Q. None whatever? A. Not that I recollect,

Q. Now, Mr. Tilton, you knew of The Christian Union, Mr. eecher's newspaper, at the time of its establishment, did voo not? A. When was it established?

Q. Well, that is exactly what I was going to ask you. [Lanchr. I understand that it was established in the beginning of the year 1870-January, 1870; in other words, that it had been existence through the year, the month of Decembe of which we are now talking about? A. I could not have newered that question, but I take your statement for it. Q. Do you recall enough of the situation to know that Mr. Beecher's newspaper, The Christian Union, had been established

th of December, in which your connection with

The Independent terminated? A. That it had or had not? Q. That it had? A. My impression is Mr. Beecher was writing editorial articles either in The Church Union or Christian Union for a number of months previous to that, but I will no Q. Do you mean that you, being the editor of The Indepen

dent all through that year of 1870, did not know whether Mr. Beecher's paper, The Christian Union, was in existence during that time? A. The Christian Union or The Church Union he come come commercial with the investment of that his compe-

tion with a newspaper at that time was with The Church Union, and not Christian Union.

The Church Union was turned into the The Christian Union! Yes, Sir; but I do not remember what name the paper bore at that time.

Q. I don't care which name it bore, but Mr. Beecher was th editor of this religious paper, in Brooklyn, wasn't he? A.

Q. Or New York? A. I think he was. Q. Prior to this time of which we are speaking? A. Whether editor-in-chief of The Church Union I am unable to say; I do not recollect the precise nature of his relation with the paper. the only recollection I have is that during 1809, he resu editorial labors in some form; I have an indistinct recollection of that

Mr. Evarts-[Looking for a letter.] Have you that letter The Witness-I think in my letter the name of the pa

given-in my letter to Mr. Bowen; whether it was The Christ ian Union or The Church Union I do not exactly reco Q. Oh, this is the letter [showing letter] -a letter from you elf to Bowen, January 1st, 1871? A. That mentions the

paper; that will give the correct name.

Q. It is in evidence here. Just look at this letter and see if will not recall the name? A. Yes, Sir; it was called The Christian Union at that time; it had been previously called The Church Union. Q. And, it was a part of the conversation of Mr. Bowen in regard to Mr. Heecher, that the letter should demand a only Mr. Bescher's abdication of his pulpit, but the cessation of his writing for The Christian Union! A. Yes, Sir; that is what

Q. But that was left out of the letter or summons? A. Yes, Q. Now, Sir, at that time, do you know how large the circula tion of this paper of Mr. Beecher's had become? A. No, Sir; I

Q. And at this time-and if so, how long before, if you know had there been started a rival paper at the West, which inte fered with the former ground of patronage of The Independent? A. I do not know of any such paper, Sir. Do you refer to The

Q. Yos, Sir. A. Old Sidney Morse used to say that all news papers helped each other, and I do not think that any one pape Q. Did you know of the establishment of The Advance as

newspaper in the West? A. Yes, Sir. Q. Appealing for patronage to the religious community? A

Q. When was that established? A. I should think in 1868 or 1869; I think about that; I cannot remember distinctly.

Q. And do you know that it was established because of dis satisfaction in some circles, or quarters or sections of opinion

at the West with The Independent? A. I think it was; yes, Sir; I think that was one ground; The Independent was too Q. And this paper was meant to be more orthodox? A. Oh I don't know about being more orthodox; I think The Indepen-dent was orthodox; orthodoxdy is my doctrine; heterodoxy is

Q. Heterodox in the sense that you mention in your letters this paper was more orthodox, and yours "liberal?" A. Yes.
The Advance, as I understand, was started to be a representative monthplece of the Congregational denomination. The Independent had cut loose from that denomination; had swung clear, and declared itself no longer an organ of the denomina ion; there was an organ of the denomination in Boston called There was no organ of the denomina-The Congregationalist. on in New York when I ceased to have The Independent the organ; they wanted such an organ in the West, and they tarted The Advance. That is the best account that I am able to give of the starting of that paper.

Q. And that had been going for two or three years-about two years? A. I will not be accurate as to the date. Q. Now, how was Mr. Bowen overruled in not including in this summons upon Mr. Beecher that he should retire from sup porting The Christian Union! A. After I wrote that note Mr Bowen said, "Why did you not put in that he should not write for The Christian Union?" I said, "I have put in enough." Q. And he yielded? A. He said nothing more about it.

ER'S MORALITY. Q. Now, Sir, you have stated that in the interview with Mr. Beecher on the 30th of December you had narrated to im, as communicated to you by your wife, certain conversa

MR. TILTON'S INSINUATIONS AGAINST MR. BEECH-

Q. And you gave us, as a part of what you stated to him, that this communication had come to you in July, 1870? A. Yes, Q. Now, Sir, between July, 1870, and the 30th day of Decem ber, 1870, had you spoken in any terms to anybody

tions between your wife and him? A. Yes, Sir.

Q. Have you named in your direct examination all the per ons to whom you had said anything in that interval concerniany relations between your wife and Mr. Beecher? A. I think I named that I gave Oliver Johnson, and Mrs. Bradshaw, and Mr. Moniton the entire truth; I spoke to certain other persons to whom I did not tell all the story; Mr. Bowen was one of

Q. I do not know what you said, but you told him the entire truth—you said that you spoke to him. Now, did you speak to any other parties? A. Members of the family? Q. Members of your own family. A. I suppose I may call my mother-in-law a member of my own family; I spoke to Mr. chards and to his wife about it.

Q. You did yourself? A. I think I did. Q. To all these people? A. Yes, Sir. Q. You have, in your direct examination, spoken of the

ast named people as having been spoken to by some persons? A. By Mrs. Morse; yes, Sir. Q But do you now say that you spoke to them yourself? They had been spoken to by Mrs. Morse, and I then spok

to them; I did not tell the story originally to them.

Q. Now, in the same interval you had, In general terms of mputation upon Mr. Beecher, in respect of morality, evere language-had you not? A. I believe that I had once or twice spoken roughly of him; I don't remember that I did, out words were brought to me afterwards as coming from me and I think quite likely that I used them; I refer, now, to a remark that I had said that Mr. Beecher preached to his mis-tresses; I don't remember having made it, but I presume that I

Q. The language that I understand you to have spoken about in your direct examination, which was imputed to you, was that you had said he preached before forty of his mistresses? Q. That may be; but the words which were imputed to ye

as having been said were "forty of his mistresses." A. It was put to me that I had said that he had preached to his mistresses; t might be "seven" or "several." Q. You are mistaken; it was put to you, by resting from etter, that you had said he had preached to forty of his misresses. A. Yes, that was stated to me; the was afterwards, in the charges brought by Mr. West-it was stated that I said that he had preached to "seven" or "several" of his mission that

Q. I don't mean those charges by Mr. West; I am speaking

of a long time afterwards; that was in 1867, and that was two ears afterwards. Now, I understand you to answer that you cannot remember that you expressed the number of mistresses that Pariment, Q. But that you did express that view! A. Understand me correctly, I do not remember having made such a remark; but it was attributed to me, and I think all the probabilities are that I made such a remark; but I do not

Q. But it was attributed to you at a point of time very near the transaction, on that occasion? A. On what occasion? Q. The occasion of your making this charge; this letter that was before you, in which the inquiry was put to you whether you had said that, was in the month of January, 1871, was it ot ? A. No. Sir : that was in the month of November, 1870

Q. No ? A. Yes, Sir. I beg pardon. Q. You do not know what I am talking about. A. I do know Q. No, you do not know what I am talking about. A. I do

ir, exactly.

were together, and a letter containing such a charge was pre-sented to you to know whether you had said so? A. That is correct so far as it goes.
Q. That was in January? A. Yes. Sir; I had received the etter in the previous November. Q. I don't know anything about that: I do not care about and I do not inquire about it. It is enough that in January th

Q. No; there was a certain meeting in 1871. A. Yes. Sir.

Q. And at that meeting Mr. Beecher, and Mr. Moulton and you

ew months between July and that date, made that imputat Then the matter was fresh in your-mind, was it not, in Janu ary, 1871, when Mr. Boecher, and Mr. Moulton, and yoursel were present? A. It was. Q. Whether or not you had accused Mr. Beecher of preaching

to forty of his mistresses or not, during the preceding Summer?

A. Yes, Sir; I made answer that probably I had spoken very

question was put to you, whether you had not, in the preceding

oughly, that I had not spared him. Q. And you believe you did say that. 'A. I will not say sed such an expression; I think the probabilities all are, tha during the Summer I made use of that expression, or its quivalent, without any definite accuracy as to the number Q. To whom bld you make use of that expression? A.

ink quite likely to Mrs. Morse or to Mr. Richards: I don't know to whom; as I said before, I don't remember having nade the remark; but as it was brought home to me in one o my wife's letters during the Summer, the chances are that I aid it: that is what I mean. Q. Now, beyond these general statements to Mr. Beecher's

prejudice during that period of time, and these statements, whatever they were, that you had made to the persons you have named, had you said anything to any one else! A. Well, sir, would not like to answer that question; perhaps I had because from July, 1870, to the end of that year, I was not under any restraining influences to Mr. Moulton, and I spoke my mind very freely sometimes.

Q. And for aught you know you mentioned this thing at se

times to other proper pesiates? A, I am very certain I did not

say anything to Mrs. Tilton's detriment, except to those three ersons that I have named, but I did not spare Mr. Beechet.
Q. You mean to Moniton and Johnson and Mr. Bradshaw A. Yes, Sir; I had some conversation with Judge Morse; I don't know how far that went, Lor do I know whether he fire

Mr. Evarts-I did not ask that,

Mr. Beach—It is very proper for him to mention. Mr. Evarts-It may be proper for him to say when some one

Mr. Beach-It is proper for him as a qualification of his

MR. THATON'S OPINION OF THE EXAMINING COMMITTEE.

Mr. Evarts-Do you remember about an attendnce before this Church Committee and an examination by uestion and answer there-do you? A. No. Sir; remember going before the Committee; I decline to have it called an exination; it was not.

Q. No matter what it was You remember being there, and questions being put to you and your making answers? A. Yes Sir: that I remember.

Q. Now, Sir, did you not say on that occasion in answer to this question: "I ask what evidence you stated against Mr. Beecher to Mr. Bowen,"—in answer to that question, did you not make this answer: "I must answer your questions in my own way. I came to tell you the whole truth, and not fragments of the truth. Mr. Bowen wanted me fragments of the truth. Mr. Bowen wanted me to speak more in the paper of Plymouth Church, Mr. Johnson said: 'Perhaps Mr. Tilton has a reason for not going to Plymouth Church,' and thereupon Mr. Bowen was curious to know the reason. I, in a solitary phrase, said that there was a personal, domestic reason why I could not go there consistently with my self-respect; that Mr. Beecher had been unhandsome in his approaches to my wife. That is the sum and substance of all I have ever said on this subject, to the very few people to whom I have spoken of it?" A. What

o your question?

Q. Didn't you in answer to the question read to you, make that answer? A. I didn't make the last part of that answer, Sir, and I repudiated in a public card that report of my interview. I distinctly, before the Committee, charged Mr. Beechar with adultery, and they did not put it in the report.

Weil, now, I am not asking you about that. It has nothing to do with it. I have asked you a simple question, whether in an ower to the question I read to you, you did not make the answer that I read to you? A. I did not, Sir.

Q. Very well; what you did afterwards I have nothing to do The Witness-I did not, Sir; in other words, that Committee en informed by me

The Witness-It is the last clause. Mr. Evarts-I have not asked you anything about it. Mr. Beach-Well, he has a right to answer that he made part of that reply and part he did not. That is just what he

was saying when you interrupted him. Mr. Evarts-No, he was not. Mr. Beach-Well, I say that he was

Mr. Evarts-I say he was not. Mr. Beach-The minutes will show. Mr, Evarts-He was talking about his repudiation of the Mr. Beach.-He was not, Sir, when the counsel last interrupted

Mr. Evarts-Well, I say he was. The Witness-That was the substance of what I said to Mr. Bowen. I didn't tell him the whole story, but I had told others

did not make that last part of the answer? A. No, Sir, I say that the answer is imperfect; part of it is omitted; that is the answer that I generally made. There were a few exceptions to that answer, namely, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Moulton and Mrs. Brad-Q. Well, with those exceptions, was the sum and substance of all that you had ever said to the persons to whom you spoke,

wife? A. Yes, Sir; impure proposals; that is the sum and the substance. I did not wish to incriminate Mrs. Tilron. Q. No matter what you wished; the fact was that that is all Cat you said ? A. That is all I said. Q. With the exception of these three persons? A. Well, understand me, Mr. Evarts, the three persons to whom I allude

are persons to whom I told the story-there were other persons

to whom I talked, to whom Mrs. Tilton told the story, and Mrs.

that Mr. Beecher had made unhandsome approaches to you

Morse told the story. Mr. Evarts-That you don't know anything about? The Witness-I do know all about it. Q. I am talking about persons to whom you communicated information. A. Yes, Sir, but I volunteered the whole story to

those three persons, with the addition, perhaps, of Judge any relations between Mr. Beecher and your wife? A. Yes, Q. About him you don't remember? A. I don't remember the exact extent of that conversation with him.

Q. Now, when you were communicating the whole story, at is another matter-but with the exception of those three persons, the sum and substance of what you communicated

ourself to other people, was the unhandsome proposals, or he impure advances? A. Yes, Sir; and then perhaps I the impure advance ought to mention that there was a chance interview in my house between Mrs. Tilton and myself, at which Bessie Turne heard the whole story.

Q. I have not asked you that. I ask you a voluntary communication which you made to outside people? A. I don't remem-ber any other voluntary communications to outside people. Q. Now, Sir, when you first spoke to Mr. Moulton on the subject of any relations between Mr. Beecher and your wife,

handsome approaches or impure proposals to your wife? Yes, Sir, that was December 26th. That is all I told him on that Q. That is all you told him that day? A. Yes, Sir.

vas not all that you told him, that Mr. Beecher had made un

Q. And that was the first time that you had spoken to him at all on the subject? A. Yes, Sir.

MR. TILTON'S PRAISE OF HIS WIFE. O. On this same examination, in answer to this que tion: "Have you not frequently asserted the purity of your wife?" did you make this answer: "No. I have always, and a strange technical use of words; I have always used words that strange remnerature of words in the conveyed that impression " A. I cannot see any sense in that word "strange," Sir; I think there must be some mispriat;

what I meant was that I had always fried-

Weil, I did not make use of any such words as "strange tech nical use; it is evidently a susprint; you can see it yourself.
Q. I don't know straing about it. You say you did not make that an wery A. Why, I say. Sir. that of course I did not me ac any such answer: "A strange technical use of words!"

There is some other—it is wrong—bad English—it is not right. I will tell you what I said-Q. Well, did you say, "I have always used words that conveyed that impression"? A. I did, Sir, and I always used such

Q. Weil, I ask whether you made that answer or not? A.

words on purpose, to convey to everybody the impression that she was a pure and good woman, and if any word of mine will carry that impression around the earth to-day, I should like to utter it from this stand. Q. Well, then, you did not words that were intended to conrey the impression of the purify of your wife? A. I did. Sir.

But I did not use it in that form, I did not use the word I used other words. I think she is a pure woman. You used words that conveyed that impression ? A. Yes, Q. But used other words to do it, with the intention vey! A. Yes, Sir.
Q. And with the effect of conveying! A. Yes, Sir; with

that deliberate design, for I hold, with Mr. Beecher, that she is Q. And with that constant effect? A. Yes, Sir.

on the 30th? A. Yes, Sir.

THE FIRST HOSTILE INTERVIEW REHEARSED. Q. Now, Mr. Tilton, you had at one time in your possession a note or memorandum of some kind, as you have stated in your direct examination, written by Mrs Tilton on the 29th of December, 1870, which you gave to Mr. Moulton when he went to bring Mr. Beecher to the interview with you

Q. At what part of the day of the 29th was that paper obned? A. Well. Sir, at this moment I don't recollect. Q. Don't you recall to yourself the occasion and the scene on which you obtained it. I don't ask you to describe it, I only

want to know whether you recall or not, to yourself, the occasion on which you received that paper from Mrs. Tilton A. I didn't see it written, Sir.
Q. What? A. I didn't see it written at all; not that I re-

you handed it to Mr. Moulton? A. Yes, Sir, nobody else saw

t his house when he was starting to go to Mr. Beecher's! A. Not until then. Q. Now, Sit, was that written on an ordinary note paper of

Q. Well, I said ordinary note paper of your wife's. We have various exhibits here—what you call a small piece of note paper?

Well, I don't remember the size of it.

Q. Well, it was an ordinary letter envelope or note paper enelope for such a note, wasn't it? A. That I don't remember

t but Mr. Moulton.
Q. And Mr. Moulton did not see it until you handed it to him

note paper? My recollection is that it was quite a petite note Whether it was ordinary or extraordinary, I could not

telope without direction on it. Q. And that was of the ordinary size for such a note? A

recall. Q. Well, you received them both together, did you not?

A. Yes, Sir; I think so.
Q. "Petite." you call it? A. Yes, Sir.
Q. Was it in an envelope? A. It was enclosed in a white en-

whether the envelope exactly fitted the paper or not; I don't

Ber Man Care

Q. Well, after receiving that paper, did it remain in your possession, and uncommunicated to any other person during the whole of the 20th and during the whole of the 20th, until

our wife's? A. It was - what do you mean by an ordinary

Yes, Sir, I think I did.

the whole story, but very few.

Mr. Evarts—Now, I have not asked you. You say that you